

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 20, 1998

LB 1175

one-third of you all eat, and one-third of you all sit out here. Then you all rotate and I'll have to stay on the floor all of that time by myself without eating, without sleeping, without resting. This is the day to get me. Get me as good today as Senator Witek got me yesterday.

SPEAKER KRISTENSEN: Senator Bohlke.

SENATOR BOHLKE: Yes, Mr. Speaker and members. First of all, Senator Chambers, I don't know, Senator Chambers, if...you don't need to answer, I'm just directing this toward you, that I heard you first of all trying to extend our session by seven days. Actually we have 13. Now if you want to put an amendment on this technical amendment to extend the session another week, we could probably get a lot of things a lot of people would like done. Second of all, I told you the last time that we went ten hours on a bill of mine that the next time you and I were going toe to toe that I was not going to be in high heels and I was going to be in comfortable clothing. Well, I did anticipate this today. I am in comfortable clothing, I'm in flats, so I'm ready to go. I will go stamina to stamina with you on this bill because it is important. Now seriously, if we would refer this back to committee, the first consequence would be that schools would not get \$125 million of special education funding. That would probably be the first reason that I think this would be a very bad idea. But let me also go to the issues that Senator Chambers did raise as far as this as a Christmas tree and not technical. What we did do is last year we had a technical bill come out of the Education Committee and it was on General File. It did not get passed last year and so we put five...five of the divisions in here are from last year's technical bill. The other amendments that you see in the committee's judgment truly were technical. They were things that were brought to the committee by individual senators. As we looked at them, they looked in our judgment as clearly technical. As we move through those amendments, I think that you will see that and really very...last year, of the last year technical bill before we put it into this, we took out anything that seemed to be controversial so we tried very, very hard to keep it technical and noncontroversial. The first section that we may debate is the only one that is controversial, but it's actually an amendment to something in the bill so, you know, within the